



KNOWLEDGE . . . LIBERTY . . . UTILITY . . . REPRESENTATION . . . RESPONSIBILITY.

VOL. I.

PHILADELPHIA, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1834.

NO. 43.

SWAIM'S PANACEA.

Much has been said about the composition of the above medicine, and some Chemists have gone so far as to declare, that the result of their analytical labors led them positively to conclude, that it contained, as a principal ingredient, some metallic preparation.

This assertion has been denied and refuted by evidence of the highest and most unquestionable character, in addition to what the public has already seen on this subject, we subjoin the following letter from the Hon. George W. Erving, our former Minister to Spain and Denmark.

Extract of a Letter, dated Paris, May 5th, 1834, from George W. Erving, of Massachusetts, (late Minister of the United States, in Spain and Denmark,) to a friend in Philadelphia.

PARIS, May 5, 1834.

My dear —, You may recollect, that when, just previous to my last departure from Philadelphia, I explained to you the merits of "Swaim's Panacea," and attributed its efficacy principally to sarsaparilla, which I thought to be its basis. I at the same time mentioned that a celebrated Chemist of your city, had informed me some years ago, that he had discovered mercury—and latterly, that he had found arsenic in this famous medicine. I was not, however, shocked by this information; I had only to transfer my gratitude from sarsaparilla to those more powerful things, acknowledging that they had completely cured the hepatic affection which had tormented me, more or less, for FOURTEEN YEARS; and which had resisted all the means, mild and vehement, external and internal, which, under the recommendation of the first physicians in this country, and some of our own, I had experimented during that period. Though three years had passed since the cure of the disorder had been effected, and I had not observed the least symptoms of its disposition to return; and consequently was free from all inquietudes; yet to "make security doubly sure," I thought it prudent to bring a few bottles of the Panacea with me, on my last departure from home, (now twelve months.) I rejoice to say, that I have not had, or am I in the least apprehensive that I shall have occasion to use it; but I found an old acquaintance here, (the Count de C—), to whom it may be useful; he has much more need of it than I ever had, though as he is nearly eighty years of age, I do not feel very confident of its success in his case. Before giving it to him, however, good faith and duty to this friend seemed to require that I should have a strict analysis made of the medicine, by the first Chemists here; for though I have not the least objection to mercury or arsenic, or hellebore, or prussic acid, I could not presume that he had none; nor could I hope to convert him (much less his physicians, if he should consult them) to my opinion in favor of the salutary, as well as vigorous, action of those drugs in all maladies to which they apply, and are used with discretion; for the French procedure in medicine, relying on the healing power of nature, is as mild and merely palliative as may be, in all cases which are not of a very alarming character.

By favor, then, of Dr. L. a principal physician in the Hospital of St. Louis, (an hospital appropriated to those afflicted by the disorder referred to) and one of those doctors whose prescriptions I followed some years ago, I obtained the analysis of which I herewith enclose a copy. It is perfectly satisfactory to my friend C. since it not only shows, contrary to the opinion of Dr. Hare, which it cites, that there is not any mercury in the Panacea, but it declares that NO MINERAL SUBSTANCE WHATEVER CAN BE FOUND IN ITS COMPOSITION.

This analysis may be useful to Mr. Swaim, and I pray you to transmit it to him, through whatever channel, or in such form as to you may seem most proper.

With very affectionate and respectful sentiments, always, your most obliged and obedient servant,

GEORGE W. ERVING.

(TRANSLATION.)

ANALYSIS OF SWAIM'S PANACEA.

A deep brown liquid, of the consistence of a clear syrup, of

an alcoholic and aromatic odor; of a sugared taste; not bitter, but a little sharp.

This medicine is of that species which is now called "Concentrated Essence," or "Liquid Extract," or "Portable Tisan of Sarsaparilla;" but it is impossible to tell what vegetable substances enter into its composition.

According to a note inserted in the Journal of Pharmacy, vol. 18, page 170, it would appear that Swaim's Panacea owes its odor at least to the volatile oil of *Gualtheria procumbens*, a small shrub analogous to the health, which grows abundantly in South America.

In the notes just now cited, it is stated that Robert Hare, Professor of Chemistry, in the University of Pennsylvania, North America, examined Swaim's Panacea, in 1827, and found mercury in it. I will confine myself to the attempt to detect the presence of this metal.

Neither the taste of the Panacea, nor the preliminary experiment made upon it by re-actives indicates that it contains any metallic substance.

It is acknowledged that mercurial salts are reduced to a state of insolubility, and often even to a metallic state, by medicine of an organic nature, to which they are often added; it was therefore in the deposit of Swaim's Panacea, that the existence of mercury should be sought.

The Panacea having been carefully decanted, the bottle was rinsed with distilled water, by which means an abundant whitish precipitate was collected, which having been well washed, was triturated with nitric acid, and evaporated to dryness. The residue was triturated with water, which only dissolved a small portion of sulphate of lime, and a minimum quantity of phosphate of lime; there was no trace of metallic substance; and, above all, not even an indication of mercurial salts. The largest portion of the residue being insoluble in water, was treated with hydrochloric acid, which dissolved it, with an exception of a sandy matter. The yellow solution deposited a yellow precipitate, containing iron and phosphate of lime, which deliquesced in the air.

The insoluble residue in the water was quite white; it was dissolved again in hydrochloric acid, which colored it deep brown; this white residue was a double phosphate of lime and iron, which is almost always found in an analysis of animal matter; the presence alone of this compound (phosphate of lime and iron) appears to indicate that some animal matter enters into the preparation of Swaim's Panacea.

Hospital at St. Louis, Paris.

ENGLISH MINISTER'S SALARIES.

The great officers of State in England, are well compensated for their labors. Of the House of Commons, the Speaker is the high functionary. His emoluments do not vary much from £8,000 sterling, per annum; also £1,000 extra, called equipment money. Immediately on his election, he receives two thousand ounces of plate, two hogsheds of claret wine, £100 to buy stationary, besides a superb residence, rent free.

First Lord of the Treasury receives £5,000; Chancellor of the Exchequer, £5,000; Lord Chancellor, £14,000; President of the Council, £2,000; Lord Privy Seal, £2,000; Secretary of State, Home Department, £5,000; Secretary of State, Foreign Department, £5,000; Secretary of State, Colonial Department, £5,000; First Lord of the Admiralty, £4,500; President of the Board of Control, £3,500; Postmaster General, £2,500; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, £3,563; Paymaster of the Forces, £2,000; Chief Secretary of State, for Ireland, £5,500. These officers constitute the King's Cabinet. The contrast between the salaries of the English and corresponding officers of the Government of the United States, is very striking.—*Scientific Tracts.*

GOLD.

\$100,000 in Gold, arrived at New York on Friday last in the Packet from Havre.

BANK'S CLAIM FOR DAMAGES ON THE FRENCH BILL.

A letter lately appeared in the National Gazette, purporting to have been written by the President of the United States Bank, setting forth the grounds on which the Bank would defend itself before the Supreme Court, should the Government commence a suit for the dividends on its stock, now withheld by that institution. Nicholas seems very anxious to have the Bank's claim of damages on account of the French Bill brought before the Supreme Court! In this he acts wisely. A court that decided the Cherokee tribe of savages to be an independent nation within the limits of Georgia; and that an officer of the Government, at a fixed salary, had a right to two and a-half per cent. commissions on all money passing through his hands; would be very likely to decide that the United States Bank had a right to remuneration, though it had received no damage, and was justified in seizing a part of the national revenue, though the Constitution declares that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in pursuance of an appropriation by Congress!

Lardner's Encyclopedia has the following on the accuracy of the British coinage:

The extreme exactness acquired and attained in the weight of coins at the royal mint, by means of the sizing machinery, has already been mentioned. On a recent examination, when put to their test as to their weight, it was found that out of 1000, 500 were quite correct, 200 varied only by half a grain, 100 more, three quarters of a grain, and the remaining 200 varied altogether a grain! This is an instance of surprising accuracy; especially when the various processes through which every single coin passes are taken into consideration.

The present Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, (Lord Lyndhurst) is a native of Boston, Mass. He left Boston with his father (the late Sir John Copely) the day preceding the battle of Lexington, which circumstance saved their family property from confiscation. The land below the Hancock estate on Beacon st., now occupied by some of the most splendid private residences in the Union, belonged to the Copely family. The widow of the late Gardiner Greene, of Boston, is sister to Lord Lyndhurst.—*Mercantile.*

Democratic Association of South Ward.

A Stated Meeting of the Association will be held on FRIDAY Evening, Jan. 2d, 1835, at 7 o'clock, at the S. E. cor. of George and 11th sts.—An Election for Officers to take place.

A COLUMBIAN PRESS.

The Editor having no occasion for more than one press, proposes to sell an Iron Cast Press of Clymer's construction, and will sell it for cost with new tympan and rolling apparatus complete—not included in the first cost. The Press is excellent.

CLOTHING STOPPED

SUPPOSED TO BE STOLEN.—A close bodied coat and pair of pantaloons, were offered for sale, of which the possessor could give no account. Enquire at 136 South Water st. dec 20-pd

MEMORANDUMS.

PHILADELPHIA,
ELIZABETH ST.—NEAR SOUTH SIXTH.

This paper is published in the quarto form—

Because it is more commodious for perusal than the folio:

Because it is better adapted for preservation, and reference; and

Because it can be more easily enlarged without affecting its convenience, by the mere lengthening of the columns, or by the addition of a quarter or half sheet, or more, if eligible.

The publication in detached numbers, is incident to the progress of the subscription; which, though it proceeds slow, goes on certain.

NUMBERS will continue to be issued, at convenient times, till the subscription shall be adequate to the expenditure, when the paper will issue daily, without any farther notice; and the detached numbers will be considered each as a day, in the year's charge.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION—Eight Dollars per annum; \$5, to be paid in advance. The paper to be issued daily, when the subscription covers the expense.



PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM DUANE.

PHILADELPHIA, DEC. 31, 1834.

SUPREME COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT.
Tuesday, December 30th, 1834.

Ordered by the Court, that a Court of Nisi Prius, be held at Philadelphia, in and for the City and County of Philadelphia, for four weeks, immediately preceding March Term 1835.

One Week for General Jury Trials.
Three do. Special Jury Trials.

ASPECTS IN EUROPE.

Every action of the two powers most conspicuous in Europe, has an influence on the affairs of other nations. Nothing can demonstrate this fact more clearly than the occurrences of change, in the administration of France and England, at the same moment, and the tendency of these incidents to operate on interests deeply affecting the policy of the United States.

The matter, as a general proposition, will be best discerned by inquiring *how* a change of ministry at Paris can have any influence at Washington?

The answer is very simple. The matter of dispute with France is very small—and a ministry hostile to liberal government, or in the confidence of Russia, Austria, and the Holy Alliance, might out of this little make great mischief. We know there are men who in old times would have worn big wigs, who will be apt to shake their slim locks at our inferences. Men will deceive themselves, but the *stuff* of European ministers is exactly the same as in the days of Cardinal de Retz, and Walpole.

Then as to England, we have on several occasions referred to the policy which was in action, in relation to the territory in Maine, about which we copy a debate in Congress, in this day's paper. The disputations or lawless occupation of a part of the territory of Maine, was an act perpetrated under the Wellington ministry.

We shall abruptly interpose a circumstance, which at the present time may abate the malevolence which first stirred up that strife, by observing that in the spirit of an old law—*what is one man's pleasure is another man's misery*. The pressure of danger in Ireland, will soften the asperity of policy in a new Wellington administration; the danger of war there, may give us quiet here.

We propose publishing in our next, a long letter or memorial, which came into our hands at the time of the change in the English ministry, which discloses facts of which no public record of any kind has yet appeared. It will go to prove designs against the peace of this Union, which the dissolution of the Wellington ministry broke up.

This much, therefore, to explain how European incidents may affect us, however neutral and just our policy may be.

We can do no more than give the lists published in both countries, though we apprehend that of England to be incomplete, as only two of the number are gazetted.

There are several great considerations, which hold a high place in the progress of society, involved in those changes. In France, the *modérés*, the *flying squad*, the *dissimulators*, are heavily mixed in the new arrangement. One of Napoleon's subalterns is sure to figure in the ministry; a very significant fact, whether taken as evidence of the talents which characterized them, or the public confidence they inspire; the other consideration is the *mixture of adverse elements*—the *Doctrinaires*.

In English policy, the retirement of Brougham, with-

out reference to any successor whatever, must mark the epocha, it is *Xerxes forbidding the waves not to advance beyond his spear*. It is saying—*Reform*, you shall go no farther; the hierarchy of the church is alarmed; it is better to follow the philosophy of Sir Joseph Yorke, and submerge Ireland in blood, rather than abolish tithes.

Such, in *amount*, is the absolute declaration. It matters not how the *Times*, or any other abandoned press, may calumniate; of such moment is Brougham.

THE NEW FRENCH MINISTRY.

The following appointments appeared in the Royal Ordinance, published in the *Moniteur*:

President of the Council and Minister of War—

The Duke of Treviso. (Marshal Mortier.)

Minister of Interior,	M. Thiers.
Minister of Foreign Affairs,	Admiral de Rigny.
Minister of Public Instruction,	M. Guizot,
Minister of Commerce,	M. Duchatel.
Minister of Justice,	M. Persil.
Minister of Finance,	M. Humann.

From the above list, it will be seen that the Cabinet is in fact, a restoration of the old Ministry, with the substitution of the Duke of Treviso, for M. Gerard. The struggle between Guizot and Thiers for supremacy, will therefore, we doubt not, be again renewed, and may, and indeed probably will, at no very distant period, again produce a dissolution of the Cabinet. M. Humann has, although, as it is asserted, with very great reluctance, undertaken the labors of Minister of Finance. The office of Minister of Marine still continues vacant. The new Cabinet does not at present possess the full confidence of the people, and the public journals have commenced commenting upon its merits and prophecying its dissolution even before the wax containing the impress of the seals of their appointments to office has had time to cool.

The announcement of their own Ministry, does not, however, appear to engage so much attention, or so deeply to interest the people of Paris, as does the dissolution and re-construction of the British Ministry. The general impression, however, is favorable to the appointment of the Duke of Wellington, whom the veteran Talleyrand has designated as the "most capable among the most capable of men."

THE NEW ENGLISH MINISTRY.

Lord Lyndhurst, will be	Lord Chancellor.
Sir James Scarlett,	Lord Chief Baron, (with a Peerage.)
Sir Charles M. Sutton,	Home Secretary.
Sir Robert Peel,	Chancellor of the Exchequer, and
	Leader of the House of Commons.
Lord Ellenborough,	Foreign Secretary.
Marquis of Chandos,	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Lord Cowley,	President of the Board of Control.
Earl of Rosslyn,	Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.
Sir Henry Hardinge,	Secretary of Ireland.
Sir C. Wetherell,	Lord Chancellor of Ireland.
Earl of Aberdeen,	Ambassador to France.
Lord Stuart de Rothsay, or	Lord Munster—
	Governor General of India.
Lord Maryborough,	Master of the Horse.
Sir Edward Sugden,	Attorney General.
Mr. Follett, or Mr. Pollock,	Solicitor General.
Mr. Goulborn, is the	Candidate for the Speaker's chair.

From the *London Gazette*, of Nov. 18.

At the Court of St. James's the 17th of November, 1834, present, the King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council.

His Majesty having been pleased to appoint the Most Noble Arthur Duke of Wellington to be one of his Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, his Grace was this day, by his Majesty's command, sworn one of his Majesty's principal Secretaries of State accordingly.

From the *Supplement to the London Gazette* of November 21.
His Majesty in Council was this day pleased to deliver the Great Seal to the Right Honorable John Lord Lyndhurst; whereupon the oath of Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain was by his Majesty's command, administered to him, and his Lordship took his place at the Board accordingly.

We understand, says the Washington Globe, that Governor Eaton reached Pensacola, with his family, on the 1st of December.

ETHICS NOT CREEDS.

No. II.

In the physical sciences, such as astronomy, chemistry, geology, &c., the phenomena proposed to be enquired into, are submitted simply to the examination of the senses aided by art; qualities of substance, solidity, gravity, motion, &c., are ascertained; and the results produce a knowledge of different qualities and each of some specific quality. Some admit of the precise measurement of quantity, others peculiarities which fix their character, all of them indications of effects by producing causes.

In Ethics the phenomena are liable to be affected by our mode of forming opinions, and by our prejudices, and therefore more difficult to be ascertained, than the qualities which are open to sensation. Benevolence, probity, and justice, are more apt to act upon the mind by their impressions than the philosophy of gravitation or motions; but are more easily affected by prejudices, by bad associations, or by sophistry; benevolence may be affected by bounds of limitation, as to mere kindred, within a country or district, to the tenets of a sect, and shut up to all others, when in truth the sentiment can have no qualification or limit: probity may be affected in the same way, as the law of the Jews concerning interest of money, which was forbidden among the Jews but admitted against strangers; so in the case of laws which affect to be founded on probity, but violate probity in favor of policy. Justice itself is liable to numerous discrepancies, by being tortured out of its moral character, into a subserviency to forms which have no moral operation in them, but effecting the entire inversion of justice under the colors of a pretended uniformity, which is never uniform; or the precedents of past ages, and of men of those ages, while the knowledge of time has rendered their forms, and opinions utterly incompatible with modern ideas; but it has been concluded from these liabilities to perversion or deception, the moral phenomena were not like the physical subject to experiment.

But if the investigators of natural history thought animated or vegetable nature admitted of no experiment, because their subjects differed from the mechanical philosophy, neither Harvey, nor Linnaeus, would have ventured to determine the circulation of the blood, or the sexual system of plants.

To this visionary incompatibility, this answer might be given generally, that you who deny the applicability of the principles of physical enquiry with morals, contradict yourselves, and prove your error by the very diversity and repugnance of your interpretations; since while you leave morals as a loose fish upon the open sea of capricious conjectures, you leave this conclusion as inevitable, that if morals are in fact realities, their reality is to be ascertained by some general principles, such as produce knowledge with certainty on other natural phenomena.

When a rational observation of moral phenomena shall be begun, make some advances, and still another, to the bounds of the phenomena; when observation proceeds by simple inductions, the regular path to all knowledge; when thus characters, dispositions, and actions are determined; then will Ethics, though treating of a different part of nature from physics, obtain its specific power of demonstration, and certainty.

The character of the different subject of Physics and Ethics, thus explains *why* they are in stages so remote from each other in the progress of discovery. In one, observation and experiment have excluded imagination and other obstacles which may be simply called supernatural; the eye is constantly fixed on nature, and the appeal and argument are found in sensible objects. But in Ethics those modes which Physics has discarded, are pertinaciously adhered to, and experiments are held to be inadmissible, because they do not assume the precise character of physics; thus in morals, demonstration has been

abandoned, and never ending ever varying hypothesis take place of the simplicity of science.

These are the first great outlines which characterise the state of Ethical knowledge, Ethical enquiry, and the chaos of uncertainty and vicious influence which follow out of it.

The subject is undoubtedly very dry, and though of the utmost moment to be understood, because the most pernicious outrages on society have been meditated and are still meditated, under the cloudy vapor of scholastic Ethics; the expectation that one at least in ten of those who read this paper may feel an interest in what so much concerns all, is a sufficient inducement to proceed; though we must say that we wish our readers generally, as well for their own useful employment of mind, and the pursuit of correct knowledge, to persevere in the perusal, which will very soon repay whatever repugnance may be overcome in the pursuit.

The methods which we have here shown to be pursued in the investigations of Physics and Ethics, account for the one having obtained an exalted perfection, while Ethics remains now as it was five thousand years ago, imperfect, and presenting aspects wholly unlike every other, in every country, and under every dispensation—Ethics are not the same in China as in Turkey, in Italy as in Scotland, in Germany as in India;—the Ethics taught at Halle are at variance with that of Gottingen; Oxford and Cambridge, almost meet Salamanca and Valladolid, by the tardy course of the former, and the augmenting progression of the latter; even in our University of Philadelphia the Ethical exercises varied at a certain period, adverse to the existing institutions of the nation; and have undergone such a variety of modifications as to leave nothing certain but the uncertainty of the system. Carry the eye over a large range—the Ethics of Harvard University are not the same as in its neighbor Cambridge, and the Ethics of Washington, Pennsylvania, no more accords with the Ethics of Carlisle, than with the Society de Propaganda, or the sublimation of imposture, the machinery of the *Temperance* and *Sunday School* Unions societies with the Elusyan mysteries.

Physics and Ethics have been treated by different methods: therefore it is that one is progressive, while the other has not even become steady, but actually retrogrades. There is, it is true, much more of pretension now than there was twenty years ago; but it is a pretension by which retrogression is confounded with progression. Two modes have been pursued, which may be called *natural* and *artificial*. That of nature, commences with a precise attention to phenomena, or to facts as presented to the senses, and tested by experiments founded on the nature of each subject, by which its qualities are ascertained, and so classes the subject with others which bear to it some characteristic similitude or analogy.

The mode of art begins with citing some authority, some hypothesis, or some conjecture. Thus in certain ages, what Plato or Aristotle said, that was philosophy; so that nature then was not to be measured by herself, but by the lessons or dreams of some philosopher, who probably did no more than modify or mystify what had been said by his predecessors in more distant ages and places.

In the cases of hypothesis and systems, those of one of the best men that perhaps ever adorned human nature, Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, may be offered as the most extraordinary exemplification of honest error in a man whose whole life was virtue.

We have, in the history of physics itself, the evidence of not merely insufficiency, but of every species of error which prevailed under its government; and the history of Ethics shows, that whatever pretensions there may be to discoveries, the same uncertainty which prevailed before Hobbes had provoked Locke, and Hume had laid the foundation of that Scots Metaphysics, which has made every thing more mysterious by attempting to supersede

reason by sophisms, and reviving, without specific designation, all the subtleties and illusions which prevailed in the scholastic logic.

The Orientals ascribed periods to the stars—they were acquainted with that solar system which Copernicus has the credit of having discovered; the Greeks when they received the knowledge brought by Pythagoras from the East, were not prepared to be good recipients. They were like the South Americans of the present day in relation to representative government; they admired the effects of liberty, and imagined that when they employed the *names* used where liberty and representation are enjoyed, that the *words* are the things; when, in fact, the words, as applied by them, are only to be explained by the most absolute contradictions.

So the Greeks received the Oriental philosophy, before they obtained the keys by which alone it could be unlocked; and made up a theory out of the materials which they could bring into harmony with imagination; and thus it was not surprising, that in their astronomy—and it is meant to comprehend all other sciences—there should be many schools, many theories, and as a necessary consequence, that all of them should be false; since there was a true system in nature which none of them would condescend to teach—because it would be derogating from the school—from Plato, Epicurus, and Zeno. Time, and often accident, corrected errors: the law of gravitation was determined by the descent of bodies of different densities from a tower of considerable elevation; the action of fluids, by the discovery, that the mercury in a tube showed a rise or fall, at the base and at the summit of a mountain. These and other discoveries, caused the method of art to be discarded in the study of nature; and that of facts to be introduced in its place.

But those who claimed the *exclusive* character of moral philosophers, were not content; they offered hypothesis still, to account for the existence of virtue, and the nature of good and evil; the Orientalists had exhausted that subject; but it was a *sine* to know what the Orientalists thought, and when the Doctors found the old ground falling away from beneath their feet, they took refuge in other theories; and their hypothesis were formed so close to life, that they were easily mistaken for life. The spirit of the corps gave fashion to each theory; at length various schools combined, each reserving some peculiarity, by which it was to be distinguished, and there have been as many systems of Ethics, as there have been theories of philosophy; and the method of art, or artifice, continues to be maintained in Ethics—leaving it as various and discordant as before the method of nature came to be adopted,—and *authority*, however ancient, however formed in ages of acknowledged ignorance, continues to be placed in absolute dominion over the laws of nature, the constitution of the human species, and even in defiance of that paramount Ethics, which the Moslem respects in contradiction of his Koran, the Hebrew in opposition to the Pentateuch, and the sectarian in opposition to the Pope and Calvin; notwithstanding that the Ethics of one is an eternal war, in the name of the God of Peace, against the other.

It may appear, in the vague manner in which Ethics have usually been treated, to refer them to any measure of art; and it is upon this presumption, that we have *Doctors in Ethics, as well as Doctors in Laws*, though not of institution. But the subject must be divested of this *artifice*, as soon as the true foundation of Ethics can be laid open. An art is simply the application of methods and rules, founded on previous experience, to practical purposes. Where they are mere laws of nature, the relation of the arts to the sciences as understood; when inferences from nature, they are marked by imitation, and made perfect by practice and habit; the true source of the division of labor.

All knowledge is the result of progressive observation of phenomena; and the laws of nature are inferences formed

upon repeated experience according to the rules of art. We seek for the principles of Ethics by a similar process, the observation of phenomena; it would be superfluous to follow the track of theory as to human progression from a beginning. All we have to do is to note the phenomena as we find them constantly in activity.

What are the propensities most manifest in man? The love of life—self-preservation. These lead to the action of the faculties, and lead to the *necessary* arts; then those that are *useful*; then the *mechanical*. The desire of being happy has been called a secondary propensity; but we consider it as identical with love of life itself, and holds a double influence over the mind, since the desire of happiness may be resolved into the desire of pleasure as belonging to the physical constitution, and pleasure that is intellectual. The finer senses display a propensity to happiness—the eye has its organic pleasures, figure, color, proportion, motion. The ear has its pleasures. The passions furnish objects for happiness, and even to grief. Imagination is the faculty of combining ideas, which are real, or derived from reality, into new forms, subject to no law; and it takes in form the name of taste, in which it approaches the fine arts, in acquiring a preference for modes of sound, modes of color, figure, &c.

The love of novelty leads also to the fine arts, which having relation to the laws of nature, lead to the *liberal* arts, so called; for the mechanical arts did not obtain perfection until the laws of motion and gravitation were discovered; nor the arts subservient to manufacture, until natural history had reached a high state of certainty.

These propensities form a part of the human constitution; and must have a corresponding application to the practice of life, which alone constitute Ethics, and it may be useful to look at the subject through the medium of these phenomena.

The first aspect of Ethics in the practice of mankind is domestic—parents and children, develop them reciprocally—they exhibit them in all, and all are happy.

We shall not follow Aristotle, or Rousseau, or Buffon—we go on a line which pervades and absorbs all their hypotheses. We go on at once from the private house to the city, and the progress is filled up by contrivances of art to sustain the new combinations, so that happiness may go on accumulating with society. The derangements of mortality, and the growth of communities, break the links which first induced to domestic good, and it becomes requisite to provide that men perform what the elder-men or patriarchs had done before. Then comes arbitrament, law, and jurisdiction, and thus Ethics becomes an art, since it is all derived from the experience of men, and the result of their efforts to be happy. Out of this arises the first Ethical laws, in the form of proverbs, or maxims, such as those of the wise men of Greece, who were either legislators or rulers, such as Thales of the Ionian, and Pythagoras of the Italic school, the first of whom said—“The most difficult knowledge is that of knowing one’s self: The most easy is that of recommending this knowledge to others.” He also said: “The only method of being great, is to avoid doing that to others which you would blame others for doing to you.” Allegory and fables do not always lead to Ethics, though it is probable the deviation is an abuse; but the fables of Krishna Sarman, from the Sanscrit, which are usually known under the name of Pilpay, or Esop, form an example of excellent models in this application of art to the uses of the imagination, and the promotion of happiness. The Oriental tales of all ages lead to moral conclusions. So much cannot be said of modern fables.

Until the rich stores of Asiatic literature, shall be revealed, which are at present under the control of the same fanaticism in Christian priests, which has characterized all religious systems; the analogies which have been customarily resorted to in Greece, must be taken only as we take Ptolemy’s map of the world, and suppose all ocean where there was only undiscovered land. We know that

Pythagoras resided with the Brahmins, and in those volumes which remain at this day, we find all, and more than all, of the identical philosophy which Pythagoras and Aristotle, Aye, and Epicurus and Zeno too, taught. It was there that philosophy formed sects and systems; there the virtues were classed, and retain the same classification at this day.

Menu had said, that the virtues are the duties we owe to each other. Pythagoras made two propositions out of this one: the duties due to ourselves—and those due to mankind; the division makes no difference. Those that relate to ourselves, direct the judgment, the appetites and the will; and form part of the catechetical instruction of some religious sects; they are called the cardinal virtues—prudence, temperance, fortitude, and justice. Those which relate to others, direct our actions.

The first of them signifies exactly the proper choice of means to produce happiness; and the great distinction between one man and another, appears to consist in distinguishing true from false objects of pleasure.

Temperance, at the present day, is held forth as a total abstinence from rum or whiskey; but it embraces a larger field: it signifies the power which man possesses, to govern all his appetites, and reduce the passions subservient to reason; it forbids getting drunk with envy, slander, and uncharitableness; it forbids imposture, by inculcating truth; it forbids avarice as the mother-vice of so many others; and inculcates to love your neighbor, and to do good unto others.

The third virtue is fortitude; and it is only the application of temperance, in its acting operation, to defensive contingencies. We act on ourselves in being temperate. We are acted upon, when fortitude is called up—so that all the accidents of life which act upon the will, are under this name, as they fit the mind for adversity, abate its force, and secure as much of happiness as can be obtained under vicissitude. This is experience.

The fourth virtue regulates our actions with regard to mankind. The same love of pleasure which leads to the virtues we owe ourselves, leads us to do justice to others. Under the impulse of the love of pleasure, men are often selfish and base. When selfish, they invade the rights of others through avarice; when base they betray confidence and friendship from malevolence. All actions which direct the will to maintain the rights of mankind, in pursuit of happiness, are comprehended in *justice*.

It must be perceived, that Ethics are here treated of under the same aspects as ancient art; and seeking similar descriptions and analogies. Another view may be taken of ancient Ethics, as a science—and science, after all, signifies no more than a right knowledge of nature.

The opening and progress of mind, from the first consciousness of sensible impressions, and discrimination of ideas, is easily traced, because it is the same after experience as before, when new objects arise. It is not until after much observation, and a habit of examining prevails, that it is perceived, nature acts in different modes in what may be denominated the great departments of Physics; and that every branch is subject also to its peculiar laws. Laws here means simply the uniformity of the same appearances or results in any class, and peculiar to that class; those of the animal department being governed by separate laws, or exhibiting phenomena which are not the same in the vegetable department.

The most successful philosophers have made their discoveries in this way. What was said of the Hindu Prometheus?—that he invented fire, because he taught how to use and control it, may be said of Lord Bacon, in relation to Physics and Ethics: for he taught that mankind had been amused with names of no signification, and of distinctions which existed only in the imagination, and not in nature; that man has been led away by his imagination, from neglect of observing the manner in which his already acquired knowledge was obtained, and not exert-

ing the strength of his own capacities; he mistook what he was—the mere interpreter of the works of nature, and not a creator; and before man can arrive at true knowledge, he must undo all that he has done in order to rebuild rationally; he must blot the past out of his mind, and begin with a new *tabula rasa*; on which the pencil of nature only, must write; he must reject imagination, and consult real phenomena; he will find them in nature, and in the useful arts; he may, with them in hand, march up to general inductions, and thus interpret nature according to her tangible laws.

It was Bacon who overthrew the thrones of empiricism and superstition. He was the great reformer; for he not only opened the before closed secrets of nature, but he suggested the application of the same laws to mind; and though, the disciple is not to be placed near the master, it may be urged as an example of the impulses which Bacon gave to Ethics, as well as to Physics, that Grotius is said to have derived his principles of the laws of war and peace, from the suggestions of Bacon; though the disciple has made but an imperfect use of the suggestions. Montesquieu, who had the merit of imbibing all that was good, and giving it a new fashion, followed Bacon more closely in his spirit of laws, though he also stumbled on the way.

Some of the numerous philosophical schools of Hindus, who have made up systems independent of their mythologic books, say that the mind in earlier times was wholly governed by imagination or assumed analogy; that from the efforts to discover the primordial, they discovered the mystery of the egg; that thus a sect was formed, because either the discoverers were satisfied, or did not know how to proceed beyond what they could not unravel; that other sects grew out of efforts to pass beyond those first imaginers, and out of those researches the emblems of generation became ulterior objects of worship; and the worshippers of this superstition are, at this day, the most numerous of all others! And thus deities were multiplied, and Ethics assumed the form and color of their imagined relatives.

The philosophers who reproved the followers of imagination and emblems, were themselves no better informed. They made use of philosophy as an instrument, and then resorted to art to reconcile nature to their theories, wholly imaginative. The mind can abstract with facility—and so form opinions, which if specious, may be taken as true; as we see abstractions worshipped with the same blind fatuity now, as five thousand years ago. The reputation of Thales and Pythagoras, was so very great, that it was supposed, human wisdom could not go beyond them. We see the same delusion every day, in twenty different groups of every society, each of them reprobating the presumption of their contemporary, claiming infallibility, and as tenacious and dogmatic as to their own. Whatever Plato or Aristotle thought was truth, so is it at this day, in twenty different places on the same day, and concerning twenty different persons, and twenty different abstractions—many of them perfectly ludicrous. There was then no chance for truth; it was heresy to dispute what was asserted by Plato or Aristotle—and so fettered the knowledge of nature and of virtue, were concealed by the clouds of philosophical categories. So says Bacon, in his *Novum Organum*.

Thales and Pythagoras had both travelled into India, and brought back rules for the managements of States—and precepts for the improvement of man. But they deformed their morality by an intermixture of the superstitions they had seen, but which, if they at all comprehended, they had altered or modified, by imaginings of their own; and exhibiting a monstrous sophistry, of which superstition alone could brook the adoption.

Socrates appears to have been the first who resisted the prevailing taste for sophistry, and to introduce Ethics, or practical morality, in its place. Poetry and philology,

which latter may be supposed to comprehend, besides the use of words, grammar and criticism, appear to have been his first studies; but upon finding that no intelligible answers could be given to the questions—"What is the origin of nature? and by what laws in the universe regulated?" he very distinctly relinquished physics, and dared not trust his imagination, so many had been deceived by it.

Remarkable it is that Socrates offered no theory of Ethics—though his disciples were numerous, many of them founders of celebrated sects. The first great question of the sects was—"What are the foundations of virtue?" The second, "what are the distinctions between good and evil, happiness and misery?" The first of these two questions seems to have laid the foundation of Ethics, independent of what had been derived from those who had borrowed from Asia; while Ethics was a mere art, the virtues had been classed, and as soon as them began to seek the sources of virtue, speculation centered in this question.

Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno, have a strong similitude. Plato assumes that man is constituted with reason, passions, and appetites; that reason is the governor, and examines the means to obtain an end. Thus there are higher passions—as love of superiority, ambition, honor; then the secondary passions or appetites, which terminate in sensual gratification. The mind with him is a little state—and virtue depends upon the ruling power.

Aristotle made a different arrangement, by a fanciful distribution of virtues in contrast; thus, *fortitude* appears between cowardice and rashness; *frugality* between avarice and profusion. Then, virtue he makes to consist in the habit of rightly discerning the characters of objects, and being directed by right reason.

Zeno taught that nature commits every man to his own care; having provided him with faculties adequate to his preservation.

These subjects are treated with much ingenuity, by Adam Smith, in his theory of moral sentiments. As to the theory of Smith, we say nothing; we refer only to what he narrates of the Greek philosophy. But those ancients concurred as to virtue, that it is founded on the proper government of the mind.

A different philosopher, Epicurus, held that pain and pleasure were the springs of all actions, and natural objects of desire or aversion; and he, like the rest, applies prudence, temperance, fortitude, and justice, to his system. The philosophy of Epicurus is most eloquently unfolded, in a small volume entitled, "*A few Days at Athens*," which, presenting a different view from the theory of moral sentiments, we leave to those who choose to read and compare them, for which the perusal will be an ample reward.

Upon the demise of the great masters, a new school was formed, by the union of many disciples of many sects—who took the title of Eclectics, significant of their forming a new philosophy out of the fragments of all the old. We shall notice them again.

Man, said they, acts partly upon the impulse of feeling, partly from reason. He is directed by both to seek his own good and that of others. All the masters were right in ascribing motives to actions; but many erred in supposing there existed only one class of motives. If selfishness were excluded, there could be no virtue. Benevolence, therefore, which is superior to them, is the highest object of praise; and therefore, the foundation of virtue. Happiness, of consequence, consists in the practice of benevolence.

This system, so amiable and social, became like all others, in progress of time, which had their foundation in mere philosophical or artificial distinctions, fell into mystery and obscurity; and a concussion of Physics with political phenomena produce the fall of ancient Ethics.

It might be perceived that the subversion of the Roman

empire was what we allude to. It was after this epocha that a new power arose: the *Church*. It might be instructive to follow it from its gradual ascent to its plenitude of potency, and oblivion of all that had preceded it in extravagance and violation of the laws of nature; to mark the extremes which distributed authority, and finally diminishing the influence it had gained.

The Church made its own Ethics; it refined upon Plato, and put Aristotle on a shelf—and made its own worldly power the interpreter and director of all obedient minds.

The Greek systems were overthrown by barbarians. The Church was subverted by itself. Had the ecclesiastical philosophers split into separate schools, each upholding a new system of Ethics, they might be compared with the rupture in the Church at the Reformation.

It is needless to repeat the share which the art of printing had in the events of those times, and its progress to this day. *Ethics* gained nothing by the Reformation—Ethics were in fact blotted out of the vocabulary; and the space was filled up with *Creed*s! Writers talk of the dark ages,—and others talk of modern superiority over the ancients,—and call this age *enlightened*! But either there are no Ethics in modern times, or there are ten thousand systems, that is, every *Creed* is a system of *Ethics* in its circle; and he who does not believe in one in preference to the other is, as Shakspeare's fool says to him who had never been at court—"like a half-roasted egg, damned all of one side."

The ancient Ethics, compared with *Creed*s, is a beautiful practical theory under every master; and he who did not understand, or he who preferred one theory to another, was not—"roasted on one side."

The Reformation was held forth as the regeneration of the world—the to-be-adopted of all men—and where are we? Instead of a Pope of Rome we have thousands of Popes, and each of them professing infallibility while they all rail at it!

The mind of man is sunk into deeper darkness than the Pagans; Ethics have no establishment; and those terms which the ancients used artificially, have been transferred to mere imaginations, which had no precedent existence! No one hears an inquiry as to the foundation of virtue; or what are the constituents of human happiness in life? The history of two thousand years is, perhaps, the most sanguinary of any antecedent period, the wars of *Ses*tris not excepted.

There is a sort of pragmatic philosophy in modern times, which is in fact no more than casuistry; which grew up with the civil law, and going along with the revolutions of time, was satisfied to exist, if unmolested, and accommodate its logic to circumstances. It is a sort of syllogistic art, which may be applied to sustain right, under principles reputed to be infallible; but which by a change of terms, or interpretation, would be—with equal infallibility too—used to sustain wrong. Flowing from the civilians, it has infected modern legislation, and employs time almost immeasurable to patch up the mischiefs which it has created, and continues to create.

Notwithstanding this contrast of modern Ethics with the ancients, and their utter absence in practice as principles any where, there were some philosophers, in the last three centuries, who bestowed some regard on them. We cannot follow them in detail, and it would be preposterous to abridge Mackintosh, whose work may be called an eloquent summary of all the modern writers on Ethics.

Hobbes, the English philosopher, stands at the head of modern Ethical writers. His theory was that man enters society from necessity; that the tendency of virtue is to improve—of vice to disturb civil government. The approbation of virtue, with him, resolves itself into self-love. Rochefoucault and Mandeville went beyond him, attempting to show that there was no difference between virtue and vice.

TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

SECOND SESSION.

IN SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 24th, 1834.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, in answer to a resolution requiring him to communicate to Congress the situation of the contract made by Edward Livingston, Esq. late Secretary of State, with Clarke and Force, for the publication of the American Diplomatic Correspondence.

On motion of Mr. WEBSTER, the communication was ordered to be printed.

Mr. WEBSTER presented a petition from sundry citizens of Boston, praying the passage of a law allowing a drawback on the exportation of cordage, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

The following resolutions were submitted:—

By Mr. McKEAN:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be instructed to inquire into the expediency of establishing a port of entry at Brownsville, on the Monongahela river.

The following resolution, submitted yesterday by Mr. CLAY, was read and adopted:

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the Senate, (if in his opinion, it shall not be incompatible with the public interest,) the instructions which have been transmitted, from time to time, since the 4th of July, 1831, to the representatives of the United States at the Government of France, relating to the execution of the treaty, which was signed on that day between the United States and France; and also all the correspondence which has passed at Washington or at Paris between the two governments respecting the execution of the said treaty.

The bill for the relief of Col. John Eugene Leisendorfer, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

[Col. Leisendorfer was one of the subordinate officers under General Eaton, when he marched from Egypt, with the forces of the exiled Bashaw Caramolle, to co-operate with the naval expedition under Commodore Preble against Tripoli, in 1804.]

Mr. BENTON, in support of the bill, went into a brief but interesting detail of the services, sufferings, and the merits of Col. Leisendorfer.

Mr. POINDEXTER opposed the bill on the ground that it would be setting a bad precedent to increase the compensation of this individual. He objected also to the provision in the third section, pensioning him on the same ground, and contended that it would furnish a good precedent for the heirs of General Eaton to make a similar claim upon Congress.

Mr. BENTON remarked that General Eaton had never received any remuneration from the Government for his services in this important expedition, but undoubtedly he or his heirs would be entitled to a proper allowance, whenever they should ask for it. As regarded pensioning his children, he believed that system never yet had been practised by the Senate, and he hoped it never would.

Mr. POINDEXTER thought many instances of the kind might be found on the statute book.

Mr. PRESTON having objected to the third section,

Mr. BENTON said he had no objection to its being struck out of the bill; and it was accordingly done.

After some remarks from Mr. WEBSTER, relative to the high character and meritorious services of Gen. Eaton,

The question was put on the engrossment of the bill for a third reading, and on a division being demanded, by Mr. POINDEXTER, the bill was ordered to be engrossed—yeas 19, nays 15.

Mr. WEBSTER then moved that when the Senate adjourn, it will adjourn to meet on Saturday next, which was agreed to.

The Senate then adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, DEC. 24, 1834.

The SPEAKER presented the following memorial, being the same as that presented by Mr. LYON, of Michigan:

Executive Office,

Detroit, December 12, 1834.

Sir—In obedience to a request of the Legislative Council of the Territory of Michigan, I have the honor to transmit to you a memorial of that body, praying the establishment of a separate Territorial Government for the district of country west of Lake Michigan.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

Your most obedient servant,

STEVENS T. MASON.

Hon. JOHN BELL,

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled.

At an extra session of the Legislative Council of the Terri-

tory of Michigan, held on the first Monday of September last, pursuant to an act of Congress of the 30th of June, 1834, an act was passed to provide for the taking a census of the inhabitants of that part of the Territory of Michigan, which is situated to the eastward of the Mississippi river.

This duty has been performed by the sheriffs of the several counties, under oath, and nearly in the same manner as that which has been heretofore adopted by the General Government to obtain an enumeration of the citizens of the United States.

The population is found to amount to ninety-two thousand six hundred and seventy-three souls.

The counties situated upon the Peninsula, and those lying north and west of Lake Michigan, contain the following numbers:—

Wayne, - - -	16,638	Jackson, - - -	1,865
Washtenaw, - - -	14,920	Berrien, - - -	1,787
Oakland, - - -	13,844	Calhoun, - - -	1,714
Monroe, - - -	8,542	Branch, - - -	764
Lenaive, - - -	7,911	Michilimackinac, - - -	891
Macomb, - - -	6,045	Chippewa, - - -	526
Cass, - - -	3,280	Brown, - - -	1,957
St. Joseph, - - -	3,168	Crawford, - - -	810
Kalamazoo, - - -	3,124	Iowa, - - -	2,683
St. Clair, - - -	2,244		

In this enumeration, the inhabitants of the country which is situated between the Mississippi and Missouri rivers, and which was, for the purpose only of temporary government, attached to the Territory of Michigan, at the last session of Congress, is not embraced. They may be justly estimated at from five to eight thousand souls.

The population of *Western Michigan*, (now generally known as the Wisconsin Territory,) may be stated at from twelve to fifteen thousand. And we would again respectfully ask of your honorable body to hear their complaints, and to grant to them speedily the relief which they pray.

The country inhabited by that people, has been subjected, at various times, to different Governments; but, on all occasions the promise seems to have been held out to them, that their subjection to those governments should be but temporary. So remote indeed have been the seats of those Governments, that it is believed neither the laws of the United States, nor of any Territory, actually had force west of Lake Michigan, until after the year 1820. About that time, a justice of the peace or notary public might be seen claiming and exercising his office there under a commission from the King of France.

The inhabitants between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi, have almost every year since their subjection to the Government of Michigan, in the year 1818, complained to Congress of the great evils under which they were suffering in consequence of this connexion. They are separated from the great majority of the inhabitants of the Territory, by one of the largest lakes upon this Continent; and it must obviously be very difficult, if not impracticable, to communicate with them during one-half of the year.

Their pursuits in life are also widely different as their habitations are distant.

It is supposed that a very large proportion of the country which lies between lake Superior, Green Bay, and the Fox, Wisconsin, and Mississippi rivers, must continue for many years, as it is now, the hunting grounds of uncivilized Indian Tribes.

South of the Wisconsin river, and within this Territory, and also in the counties of Dubuque and Des Moines, West of the Mississippi, are situated the very extensive and valuable lead mines of the United States. The miners are the immediate tenants of the Government, pursuing a very laborious and hazardous business, and paying their rent to it as a landlord. It is presumed they are, for these reasons, entitled to its special attention and protection. They compose more than two-thirds of the population of that part of the Territory, and they reside upwards of six hundred miles, (some as much as nine hundred miles) from the seat of Territorial Government.

The judiciary system in that section of the Territory, likewise, is so weak and inefficient, that the laws afford little or no protection to the virtuous, nor does their prompt and energetic administration, deter the vicious.

It is feared by that people, that these, and even greater evils, are about to be entailed upon them and their country, forever, by the formation of a State Government by the eighty-seven thousand two hundred and seventy-three people inhabiting the Peninsula of Michigan, and the counties north of the Peninsula, for the whole of the Territory which lies north of the line drawn east through the southerly bend of Lake Michigan.

It is to this unnatural union, so prejudicial to the best interests of the inhabitants of western Michigan, and destructive to their rights as American citizens, your memorialist would respectfully call the attention of your honorable body; and they do respectfully ask, on behalf of the citizens of the whole Territory, that

Congress will, at its present session, establish a Territorial Government for the citizens inhabiting the territory lying west of a line drawn through the middle of Lake Michigan to the northern extremity, and thence north to the boundary line of the United States.

Your memorialists respectfully refer to the act to provide for taking a census of the inhabitants of Michigan, passed by the Council, September 6, 1834, together with the aggregate returns of the census taken under the said act, copies of which said documents, duly certified by the Secretary of the Territory, are herewith presented to your honorable body.

Resolved, That his Excellency the acting Governor, be, and he is hereby requested, to transmit copies of the preceding memorial to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Delegate in Congress from this Territory.

COUNCIL CHAMBER,

Detroit, December 12, 1834.

JOHN McDONELL,

President of the Legislative Council.

JOHN NORVELL, Secretary.

Mr. REYNOLDS offered the following resolution, which, under the rule, lies one day:

Resolved, That hereafter, in all elections made by the House of Representatives for officers, the votes shall be given *viva voce* each member in his place naming aloud the person for whom he votes.

The joint resolution fixing a day, &c. for the delivery of an address by John Quincy Adams, on the life and character of Lafayette, was concurred in.

The following resolutions submitted yesterday, were taken up and agreed to:

By Mr. HUBBARD:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to communicate to this House, copies of any correspondence which has taken place between himself or any of his predecessors in office since 1834, as far as practicable, with any of the officers of the Bank of the United States, or of any of its Branches, which may have any relation to the claim of the United States against the Bank of Columbia, and to communicate his opinion as to the probability of collecting the balance, or any part thereof, now due from the Bank of Columbia to the United States.

By Mr. PEARCE, of Rhode Island:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to communicate to this House, such information as he may have, and which in his opinion may be proper to be communicated, and not incompatible with the public interest, showing the steps which have been taken and the progress which has been made in effecting an adjustment and satisfaction of the claims of American Citizens upon the Mexican Government.

The following resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. LINCOLN, was taken up:

Resolved, That the President of the United States, be requested to lay before this House (if, in his opinion, it is not incompatible with the public interest) any communications which may have been had between the Government of the United States and that of Great Britain, since the rejection by the former of the advisory opinion of the King of the Netherlands in reference to the establishment and final settlement of the Northeastern boundary of the United States, heretofore in controversy between the two governments.

And that he also be requested to communicate any information he may possess of the exercise of practical jurisdiction by the authorities of the British Province of New Brunswick over the disputed territory within the limits of the State of Maine, according to the true line of boundary as claimed by the United States, and especially upon that part of the territory which has been incorporated by the government of Maine into the town of Madawaska; together with such representations and correspondence (if any) as have been had by the executive of that State with the Government of the United States, on the subject.

Mr. PARKS said this resolution was in relation to a matter of peculiar interest to the citizens of Maine. As no member of the delegation from that State in either branch of Congress, had thought it necessary to come forward with a call for information on this subject, he wished to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Lincoln,) what were the reasons which had induced him to offer this resolution.

Mr. LINCOLN said, it would afford him pleasure to respond to the inquiry of the gentleman. The subject involved in the motion he had submitted, was one of deep interest to the people of Massachusetts, and he would be faithful to his trust, were he to suffer any opportunity to pass, to maintain and vindicate that interest. By the act of Massachusetts, whereby Maine had become a separate and independent State, there was a reservation of a right to enjoy in common, a moiety of the proceeds of the sales of unappropriated and uncultivated lands, situated within

the boundary of the new State, amounting to about 5,000,000 of acres. The British Government had set up a strong pretension to these lands, under the treaty of 1783—in which Massachusetts was so largely interested. The matter in dispute was finally referred to the arbitrament of the King of the Netherlands, who had merely indicated an opinion adverse to the interests of Maine and Massachusetts. This opinion produced great excitement in the two States. The Legislature of Maine protested against it in strong language, and sent a Commissioner to the Legislature of Massachusetts, (who is now a member of this House, Mr. Parks,) calling upon that state to stand by her in preventing this encroachment upon her territory and sovereignty. Massachusetts did pledge her faith, that in all times and all circumstances, she would stand by Maine, in opposition to this decision of the King of the Netherlands, which, if carried into effect, would operate as a transfer of the citizens of a free country to the dominion of a foreign government, and a monarchy. These remonstrances were felt in the councils of the nation. [Mr. L. here read the resolutions which were submitted to the Senate of the United States on this subject.]

Mr. L. referred to the last annual message of the President, in order to show that the negotiations upon the subject of this boundary line were not re-opened. It was for the purpose of knowing whether this was intended to be done, and what was doing by the Government on this subject, that he had offered the resolution. He entered into a history of the negotiations which had taken place, and of the treatment which the citizens of Maine had received from the British authorities, particularly at Madawaska. The honor of Maine was not in his custody—but in abler hands. It was, however, time to know whether this controversy was to be settled, and in what manner. It was due to the States of Maine and Massachusetts, that they should be informed on this subject. Their respective Legislatures would assemble in a few days, and they should be made acquainted with the present state of this controversy. If he knew any thing of the temper of these Governments, they would not much longer submit to tardy negotiation on this subject. It was with these views, (and which he explained much more at length,) that he had been induced to offer the resolution.

Mr. PARKS said, the House would perceive by this time, that the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts was a most extraordinary character, and the reasons which he had given for bringing it forward, he must say, were equally extraordinary. The gentleman gives as a reason for his interference in the affairs of another State, that Massachusetts was interested in the matter. It was true, that when the People of Maine determined to assume the rank of a free and independent community or State, she was compelled by her kind guardian mother, Massachusetts, to pay well for her liberty—to purchase her freedom at a high price, by asserting that Massachusetts should be the owner with her in common of the wild lands then undisposed of within her territory; but she did not grant to Massachusetts any jurisdiction over the same. Maine will always recollect these circumstances. The last, the gentleman from Massachusetts seems to have forgotten, for he now comes forward to ask; as he is pleased to say, as a member from Massachusetts, interested in the property, to inquire whether the jurisdiction of Maine has been infringed upon, exhibiting a kind parental solicitude, as if she had no one on this floor or in the other House, to watch over her honor or protect her rights; and this too without any instructions from Massachusetts to move at all in the matter. If Massachusetts believes that Maine has violated her faith pledged to her by the solemn act that effected the separation, let her, as a State, call on Maine as a State, each in their sovereign capacities, for a breach of that compact, for by that compact alone has she any right of ownership in the territory in question, and with that compact, this federal government has nothing to do. When Maine fails to fulfil any of her obligations, then she will have a right to complain, and to take such measure, as a State, as she may think advisable, but even then she will have no right to come here for redress. The State of Maine is not to be called to the bar of this House to answer for her conduct to Massachusetts. I aver that the gentleman, in the capacity in which he makes this call, viz. as a representative of Massachusetts, has no right, on this floor, to interfere with the question of jurisdiction of Maine within her own limits. Thank God the time has passed by, when she has any legal right to interfere in our internal relations, or external either, excepting such as may regard our engagements with herself. But, further, sir, if she desires information upon this matter, she has the materials for it within herself. She has but to call upon her own land agent and she will get information much more correct and accurate than can be possibly in the possession of any department of this government. Her land agent traverses every portion of our extensive forests without let, hindrance, or control; he has as many deputies as he chooses to employ, and the honorable gentleman, from the official situations he has for so many years held as the

Governor of Massachusetts, must know full well that no individual in this nation has more information upon that branch of his inquiry, than the gentleman who so honorably and faithfully fills the office of her land agent. But, sir, the honorable gentleman goes further, he calls for any correspondence that may have taken place between the government of Maine and the government of the United States, upon this same subject of jurisdiction, and this too, as I understand, likewise in his capacity as a member from Massachusetts. To this I answer, that to Massachusetts she is not accountable for any thing that may have taken place between her, as a State, and the general government. Whenever Massachusetts as an individual owner of certain real estate within her limits, is injured by any act or conduct of hers, then she, like all other individuals, may seek her remedy from that State; but she must recollect she is but an individual proprietor, having a stake in the soil, and the soil only.

But, sir, let us suppose that the gentleman quits the position he assumed, as calling for this information as a member of Massachusetts, and that he calls for it in his relation as the representative of a part of the People of the United States on this floor—should it be granted? Neither of the members from Maine have desired it; nay, the honorable gentleman confesses that he did not consult any one of them upon the subject; neither has the Executive desired it, either for its own justification, or any other purpose. Neither of the parties interested, and only interested have made any request on the subject; and yet, the gentleman from Massachusetts, out of his abundant regard and solicitude for the interests and honor of Maine, (for I can see no other reason,) wishes to know whether the jurisdiction of Maine has been infringed upon, and desires to see (if any) what correspondence has taken place between her and the General Government on the subject. Sir, it seems to me that such curiosity in a stranger to the parties, is improper, if it is not officious. Sir, I do not object, to this resolution because I fear that in any manner it will (if passed) implicate the honor of the State which, in part, I represent on this floor. I expressly disavow any such feeling. So far as the honor of the State is concerned, I should be perfectly willing to have every act done, every word written, and every thing proposed or intimated by that State, laid open to the world. I fear not that she would suffer by it. I object solely for two reasons; in the first place, that if, as from the President's message, a hope remains of a peaceable adjustment of this perplexing question, a full answer to the resolution would not do good, but might do harm. And secondly, because the call, coming as it does, is derogatory to the State, and to its members upon the floor of this and the other House, and among whom are some of the gentleman's most ardent political friends. I do not understand from the gentleman that he contemplates any legislative action of this House upon the subject, nor, indeed, can I well see how any can be had. If any communications have taken place between the government of Maine and the General Government, it must be in the character of the latter, as general guarantee to the individual States of their rights and territory, and to the Executive in his capacity as a component part of the treaty-making power, through which all attempts at a peaceable adjustment of this controversy must be had. Does this House seek to intrude itself upon that power, and appropriate to itself rights which, by the constitution, are secured to different branches of the Government? But, sir, I principally oppose the resolution, because uncalled for as it is, either by the Executive Government on the one hand, and the State on the other. This House ought to have too much respect for the rights of States, to countenance this attempt of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the more especially as from his own statement he does not make the call in his capacity as a Legislator of the Union, but as a member of Massachusetts; which State, from common civility to her sister State, should have made the call, if necessary, directly upon her. I warn this House to be careful how they justify this course—how they approve this precedent. I ask what would have been the language of Georgia, for example if, contrary to either her wishes or that of the General Government, the correspondence of her Executive with the Executive of the Union, had been called for by a member from a different State, wholly uninterested in the matter, what would have been the feelings of that State, or of any other State in the Union? I say that a precedent for this call, made in this manner, cannot be found in the whole legislative history of this country; and I again warn the real friends of State Rights how they countenance it. It is derogatory to every member of both Houses of Congress from Maine, because it virtually premises that they are forgetful of her honor and interest—

[Here Mr. LINCOLN disavowed any intention of arraigning Maine, or of interfering in any way with her honor or interest.]

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that the honorable gentleman expressly disavows any such intent, and I am not the less aware, sir, that such is the inference that must be drawn from the resolution, viz. that the members from Maine are derelict to her ho-

nor and interests, and that they have to take wing and lodge themselves under the protecting and fostering care of Massachusetts. The gentleman says, "Would to God I could speak for Maine on this floor." Mr. Speaker, I well know that Massachusetts has a strong desire to take the benighted people of Maine under her care and protection, and that nothing prevents but the indifference of the people themselves, to profit by so high an honor. I should have thought, sir, but for the resolution of yesterday, that the people of the State which the gentleman represents, must by this time have learned, by the frequent rejection of their kind offices, and more particularly by the events of the last summer, that the people of Maine consider themselves as of age, and abundantly capable of forming their own opinions on public matters, protecting their own rights and honor, and securing her own best interests. The gentleman says the honor of Maine is not in his hands. True sir, it is not. It is here in the hands of her Senators and Representatives, and when they shall prove recreant to, or insufficient for, the task confided to them, he will recall them, and either send others better fitted for the trust, or perhaps call on the gentleman from Massachusetts for aid.

Mr. Speaker, I again repeat that I do not oppose the passage of this resolution because I fear that any developments that might be made, would compromise the honor of my State. I believe it is "above fear and above reproach;" if not—then let her suffer for it. But, sir, I oppose it, as setting a precedent injurious, as I believe, to State rights, and as being an unauthorized interference in the affairs existing between one of the sovereign states of this Union and the general government, which will tend strongly, to say the least, to destroy all that parliamentary courtesy which ought ever to exist on this floor, between the representatives of the people of different independent communities.

Mr. EVANS was ignorant of the intention of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Lincoln) to offer the resolution under consideration. He contended that the motion was not only proper, but necessary. That information was requisite to enable members from the State of Maine to act and vote understandingly on this important subject. Massachusetts, he said, was no volunteer in the matter; her aid had been asked by a special mission from the State of Maine; and even if it were not so, any member on that floor, let him come from what State he might, had a right to ask for the information required, Maine had invariably looked to the aid of Massachusetts in the progress of this controversy. She had not looked in vain, and she had always felt grateful to that State for the co-operation and support which she had received from that quarter. This was the first time that he had ever heard Massachusetts reproached for her determination to stand by Maine in this contest.

[Mr. PARKS explained. He did not reproach Massachusetts because he had consented to stand by Maine in this controversy. But he did not thank Massachusetts for coming forward here with a proposition on this subject, without consulting Maine or any one of her members on this floor.]

Mr. EVANS continued. His colleague did not think that because Massachusetts held an interest in the property within the territory in dispute with Great Britain, that she had any right to interfere, and he had also stepped aside to assail the manner in which this right of property was acquired by Massachusetts. The separation of Maine from Massachusetts was a matter of compromise. There were a great many individuals in the present State of Maine, who were opposed to the separation, because, perhaps they were unwilling to part with the preponderating political influence of Massachusetts. His colleague was among the number who were decidedly opposed to the separation.

[Mr. PARKS again rose in explanation. He opposed the terms of separation, because the new State was required to surrender to Massachusetts so much of her territory, and not in consequence of any political consideration.]

Mr. E. said, he accepted the explanation. He did not pretend to know the precise motives which had actuated his colleague, and he begged his pardon if he had mistaken them.

But his colleague had argued that this call for information was unnecessary inasmuch as no legislative action was contemplated, or could necessarily grow out of it. How does he know this? If it should turn out that the government of Great Britain was exercising practical jurisdiction within the territory in dispute, contrary to a positive pledge to refrain from any such assumption, might not legislation on our part very properly flow from such a course of proceedings?

Mr. E. proceeded at some length to examine the history of the negotiations with Great Britain in relation to the matter in dispute, and contended that Massachusetts held such an interest in the decision of the subject, as would completely justify her in inquiring what was the present state of these negotiations. For aught she knows, a proposition might be made by the British Government to pay a sum in money for the lands in dispute and so, had not that State a right to inquire what disposition had

been, or was to be made of this money? He could not see how Maine could be degraded by such a step on the part of Massachusetts. Perhaps his colleagues had some knowledge touching the present state of the negotiations on the subject. He had none. He desired to have this information—he wished to know whether the negotiation was resumed upon a basis which would satisfy Maine. On this subject his colleague seemed content—he was not. It was true that Maine had been very quiescent for some time past. They had been no Minister in London, (where the negotiations were pending,) for this boundary question had formed a most exciting topic in Maine. Latterly there had been great apathy—hardly a whisper was heard. Those who formerly spoke the most and the loudest on this subject had become perfectly calm and indifferent.

In conclusion, Mr. E. said, that this was a question in which the whole Union should feel interested. The disputed territory, although a part of the State of Maine, was also a part of the United States, and he could see no impropriety in a member from any other State, proposing a call for information, upon a subject in which the nation generally was concerned.

Mr. LINCOLN said, that from the admonition he had received from the first member from Maine (Mr. Parks) who had addressed the House, it might hereafter be a question of consideration how far it would be proper for him to submit a proposition here without first seeking a conference with that gentleman. He offered as an apology for what had been termed a gratuitous interference with the affairs of Maine, the peculiar interest which Massachusetts possessed in the subject. The member from Maine had evaded the true question, and had referred to motives. His motives in offering the resolution were of a most disinterested character. But the gentleman had complained of the terms upon which Maine had become an independent State. Was that complaint just? He thought not. Massachusetts, prior to the separation, was a first rate State in point of population and territory, and by the act of separation she was, in this particular, only a third rate State. Was it therefore unreasonable that she should seek to retain a part of the waste and uncultivated lands within the boundary of the new State, to be disposed of for her peculiar benefit? Was that act derogatory to her? Were not similar terms exacted upon the admission of the other States into the Union? Had not Massachusetts as much right to claim this reservation, as had the United States to retain wild and uncultivated lands, subject to her future disposition upon the formation of a new and independent State? This was no new principle. It was the first time that he had heard Massachusetts accused of having agreed to the separation by imposing hard and unfair terms upon Maine. There was a time, and there was record evidence of the fact, that quite a different feeling prevailed.

Mr. L. was at a loss to perceive any objection which could be properly urged against the proposed call for information. The subject to which it had reference, involved interests of great magnitude. No less than 5,000,000 acres of land, worth about \$15,000,000, were in dispute. The question relative to French spoliation, was of far less importance, and even that question was now agitating the whole country. It had been urged that Massachusetts could obtain the desired information through her land agents in Maine. This was a mistake. They could not obtain it. Besides, they might be arrested by the British authorities. The gentleman said that no legislation was to follow upon the reception of this information. Who authorized him to make any such assertion? But it was contended that it was derogatory to go to the Department here for the correspondence with the Government of Maine; and it was asked why we do not seek it by applying to the latter? There was a reason why Massachusetts should not apply to Maine for information. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. Parks,) was appointed a Commissioner to seek the aid of Massachusetts in preventing a surrender of this disputed territory. Massachusetts did pledge herself to stand by Maine in this controversy. What shortly followed this pledge? Why the Legislature of Maine, with closed doors, received a proposition to surrender to the General Government the whole territory in dispute, to be negotiated for money, and this, without informing Massachusetts that she had taken such a step. But this call did not propose to go back that far in the history of the transaction; and the gentleman need not fear that any thing would be furnished connected with the proceedings to which he had just referred. He intended no indignity to the Government of Maine in his resolution. He had proposed a simple call for information, which might be given, if not incompatible with the public interest. He thought it important to the interests of those he represented, that this information should be obtained, and it was with that view he had submitted the motion.

Mr. FOSTER, in addressing the House, remarked, that it was very annoying to be engaged in, or to interfere with family quarrels,—but the positions taken, and allusions made by various members, would justify a few remarks from him. He could see

no positive impropriety in the call on the President for information proposed in the resolution. There appeared to him just as much propriety in a call upon the President for information in regard to a negotiation between the State of Maine and the General Government, as if that negotiation were pending between the latter and a foreign power. If this call had been made upon the State of Maine, it would, of course, have been inadmissible; and if gentlemen had called upon him for his opinion upon that point, it would freely have been given. The jurisdiction of the Federal Courts was operative in Maine as in other States. After a few other remarks, (inaudible to the Reporter,) Mr. F. said he heard from gentlemen on that floor words like "*the free, sovereign, and independent State of Maine.*" It was music to his ears, and sounded like the harbinger of the final predominance of correct principles. It looked as if Maine, at least, was not only assenting to, but about again enjoying her sovereign and unalienable State rights. Mr. F. said it would be remembered that he had, at a former period, had occasion to broach this doctrine on the floor, and he rejoiced to hear it boldly pronounced there, by the gentleman from Maine, (Mr. Evans,) that the General Government of the United States possessed no power to dispose of any territory of his State, and that if that General Government did so the act would be null, unconstitutional, and void. This very principle, said Mr. F. has heretofore been prostrated by the force of—a name. He would gladly, on all occasions, stand by the State of Maine, when she asserted those principles, so vitally important in the preservation of our free institutions. An allusion had been made to the fact that Maine had sent a Minister Plenipotentiary to Massachusetts to negotiate in reference to her rights. This was all considered perfectly justifiable on the part of Maine, but how long was it since another State was sneered at for a similar act? He held that the States, in their individual and sovereign capacities, had the right of treating with each other by Ministers, delegates, or otherwise. He referred to the resolutions passed some four or five years ago by the Legislature of Maine and of Massachusetts on this northern boundary and State Rights question. He hailed them, and he hoped they would long be hailed as burning and shining lights to govern other States, who were seeking and struggling for their rights—those rights which were never delegated, and which were inherent only in themselves. He would warn such States that in these principles was the rock of their political salvation; and he rejoiced to see them spreading from one end of the Union to the other. He concluded by hoping that all opposition to the adoption of the resolution would be withdrawn.

Mr. GILLET here moved to lay the resolution on the table, which he afterwards modified by a call for the orders of the day.

The question on this motion was decided in the negative—ayes 62, noes 70.

Mr. SMITH said, if he were influenced by the feelings or some of the prominent considerations which had been expressed by his honorable colleague who had last spoken, (Mr. Evans,) in relation to the resolution of the honorable gentlemen from Massachusetts, he certainly could not feel justified in giving the vote which his honorable colleague had indicated he should give, nor in entertaining the conclusions which he does upon this subject.

The House will remark, Sir, that my colleague commenced his observations with an expression of entire indifference as to the fate of the resolution which the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered. Sir, were I indifferent to a resolution, involving matters of such vast importance to the State of Maine, being one of her Representatives, I could not vote in favor of it.

But the gentleman next said, that he does not think any thing can come out of the resolution if passed; that he has no idea that the Executive will answer it, or will answer it in any other way than by saying that he has no information that can be communicated relative to the subject-matter of this resolution, without prejudice to the pending negotiation. Sir, if I entertained this conviction, I certainly should feel myself warring with my sense of duty to vote in favor of the resolution. Why pass it, with such an expectation?

Again, the gentleman says, that he very much questions the propriety of the Executive's exposing the correspondence and other documents involved in the subject-matter of this resolution, at the present time, and while the negotiation is pending between this Government and Great Britain. Sir, could a better reason be given than such a conviction, to justify and demand that gentleman's vote against the resolution? I confess, I am unable to conceive of a stronger motive for opposing the resolution, than the gentleman himself has thus avowed. And yet he expresses his determination to vote in favor, and advocates the adoption of the resolution!—[To be continued.]

The American Ambassador at Paris, Mr. Livingston, was present at the soiree, November 6th, of the President of the Chamber of Deputies, M. Dupin.

From the Globe.

THE NEW ORLEANS MAIL.

An article is republished in the *Intelligencer*, the object of which is to contradict a statement made by the President of the United States in his reply to an address forwarded to him by the order of a public meeting in New Orleans. The President stated to the meeting in his letter:

"You will perceive that the Postmaster General cannot be justly blamed for this reduction. His plan of retrenchment would have brought the expenditures of the Department within its revenues in the course of a short period, without touching the arrangements then existing for the transportation of the mail, if Congress had granted the moderate loan applied for at the last session. This application having been refused by the majority of the Senate, the Department was of course obliged to take the steps which were in its power, from its own resources, to meet the demands against it.

"In the discharge of this duty, there has been a necessary reduction in the accommodations to the city of New Orleans, it would seem, therefore, that no blame can be properly ascribed to him, but to the majority of the SENATE, among whom is found the Senators of your State, who withheld the appropriation which would have prevented the reduction."

The opposition press now contend that the information contained in this reply, is contradicted by the following remark, made in Mr. BARRY's late report:

"No part of this debt was contracted upon the credit of the Treasury, nor upon any other credit or authority than that of the Department alone.

"It was never regarded by either of the parties in the character of the debt of the Government, but a mere expedient to anticipate the resources of the Department, based upon the credit of those resources alone.

"The means of its liquidation within a reasonable time, were always within the legal control of the head of the Department, and no other means at any other time have been sought or desired by the Department."

Now, there would be a discrepancy between the President's remark and the Postmaster General's report, if the suggested proposition for a loan had proceeded from the Postmaster General. But it did not proceed from him, nor did he express a desire, when the inquiry was made, that a loan should be obtained. The history of the matter is given in the following notes.

Senate Chamber, April 24, 1834.

SIR: I am directed by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to ask you to inform them what money advanced to your Department would enable you, with the aid of its present means, to discharge the debts, and comply punctually with the existing engagements of the Department; and at what time or times the amount thus advanced could be refunded by the Department without injury to its successful administration.

FELIX GRUNDY.

Hon. WM. T. BARRY, P. M. G.

Post Office Department, May 1, 1834.

SIR: In answer to your inquiry of the 24th ult., I have the honor to state that if, of the monies which have heretofore been paid by the Department into the Treasury, there can be now advanced to this Department the sum of four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, it will enable the Department, with the aid of its present means, to discharge its debts, and comply punctually with its existing engagements.

The amount thus advanced can be returned to the Treasury without injury to the successful administration of the Department, as follows, viz.

On the 1st July, 1835,	\$ 150,000
1st July, 1836,	150,000
1st March, 1837,	150,000
	— \$ 450,000

I have the honor to be,

Very Respectfully,

Your Obedient Servant,

W. T. BARRY.

Hon. FELIX GRUNDY,
Chairman of the Com. &c.

From the above, it will be seen that the committee, the majority of which is hostile to Mr. Barry, first suggested the idea of a loan from the surplus on hand in the Treasury, for the purpose of saving the valuable routes which Mr. Barry had put in operation, until these routes should become thoroughly established and repay to the Department the expenditure which had brought it in debt to originate them. Mr. Barry said this could be accomplished in three years. But the committee, so far from prosecuting the design indicated by their inquiry, resolved rather to

raise a clamor in the country, by compelling the Postmaster General to withdraw the mail facilities he had extended upon the great leading routes, instead of affording the contemplated loan to continue them. In pursuance of this scheme, perceiving from the Postmaster General's assurances that the routes would pay for themselves in the course of three years, and extinguish the debt which had been incurred by them in the infancy of their establishment—they entered up a resolution declaring that the act of the Postmaster, in making a loan from the Banks to meet the exigency of the Department, was a violation of law and the constitution.

This resolution was equivalent to an order for instant retrenchment by the Post Office Department, and as it was voted for by both the Senators from Louisiana, it was in effect a vote, on their part, in favor of the reduction of the daily mail facility extended to New Orleans, at an expense, if we remember rightly, of \$40,000 per annum. But the Postmaster General could not be mistaken as to the direction it was expected he should give the retrenchment called for, when he took into consideration another part of the committee's report. This report thus expressly denounces the New Orleans contract by name. It says:

"The waste of money on this contract was enormous. The nett proceeds of all the postages in the city of New Orleans and the town of Mobile are hardly sufficient to sustain it. The law has been violated by entering into a contract to get up a steam boat line for the transportation of the mail, without any regard to legal restrictions. It was violated by the Department, when it entered into a contract for the transportation of the mail, without an advertisement inviting public competition."

Mr. Wright moved that this report should be laid on the table, but the Louisiana Senators signified, by the vote given on this question—the only vote taken, tending to test the sentiment of Senators in relation thereto—that they were in favor of it. Both Messrs. Waggaman and Porter voted against putting the report to sleep on the table—and neither of them expressed the least dissatisfaction with that part of it which condensed the Louisiana mail contract, and which virtually called for its rescission. It was of course rescinded by Mr. Barry; and the constituents of Messrs. Waggaman and Porter have raised the hue and cry against Mr. Barry, who involved his Department in difficulties to serve them—quite forgetting that their own Senators, and their political allies, left him no alternative, but a withdrawal of the mail, by denying the means of continuing it—by pronouncing the use of the credit of his own Department to maintain it, unconstitutional—and, finally, by favoring the report expressly declaring the contract under which it was made, a waste of money, as well as illegal.

FRANCE.

The extract given below is a liberal translation of a paragraph of a letter from a gentleman who is well informed, through a direct source, of the state of things which led to the late dissolution of the French Cabinet. The facts given may, therefore, be implicitly relied on. The letter is from Paris, under date of 15th November.

"In consequence of intestine discussions, the old Ministry was dismembered, and after ten days' useless efforts, could not re-compose themselves. The King decided, at last, to take an entirely new Ministry, the chief of which was the Duke de Bassano, formerly Imperial Minister. There were very honorable men in this Ministry: But they had not come to an understanding on the most important questions. In consequence, there was disagreement amongst them at the first debate. The first question brought up was the American debt, and it so happened there were three of the new Ministers who had voted against the law last year. They consequently declared, that even if they were convinced that they had been misled, they would not pledge themselves to present the project of a law. The King insisted, and declared it was a necessity, under pain of a war, in which he would not involve himself. They all resigned at the end of three days; so at this hour we are without a Ministry; but what is certain is, that the old Cabinet will come back with some modifications. It is the only combination possible, and it is a fortunate one for the indemnity of 25,000,000."

It will be gratifying to the American People to perceive, that the French King regards a willingness to fulfil his treaty stipulations as an essential requisite in the members of his cabinet, and that he declares the fulfilment "a necessity under pain of a war, in which he would not involve himself." This proves that the King has acted in good faith—that the delays have not arisen from a disposition on his part, to defeat by indirection, what he has directly recognised to be right—that he has taken a stand in his executive councils to satisfy the world, that he is neither so reckless of his character as a man, as to countenance the opinion that he would perfidiously sacrifice the solemn obligations into which he has entered, to considerations of convenience—nor so feeble as a monarch—so wanting in influence with his people, as

to be incapable of insisting on the performance of a duty which his station imposes.

But what will the press of the opposition, which has so generally condemned the views of the message upon the subject of our French difficulty, say, when it is perceived that the King of France has anticipated still stronger recommendations? That in his inferences as to the redress to which appeal would be made, on our part, to vindicate the national rights and honor, on a failure to comply with the treaty, he has even gone beyond the measure to which our own Executive has proposed to resort? The French King considers it as a matter of course, that the wrong committed, in withholding the indemnity and the insult superadded in the violation of a solemn treaty, must be followed by instant war. The American President, however, proposes only to seek redress through REPRISALS for the actual damages sustained by our citizens, without making an appeal to arms to resent the national indignity offered in the violation of the treaty! And this resort to reprisals—a remedy universally recognised as *pacific* under similar circumstances—is only suggested by the President upon a second and final refusal of all voluntary redress.

All the prints of the opposition are compelled to admit, that the President asks nothing of France but what "is clearly right." In condemning, then, the recommendation of the mildest possible remedy which can be resorted to, after every appeal to the offending party for redress shall have been made in vain, the enemies of the administration, in effect, propose to the nation that it shall not only submit to "what is wrong," but that it shall submit to injury coupled with insult.

The National Intelligencer and the Telegraph, and all the other engines which are plied by the two branches of the opposition in this country, while they take a course to induce the French people to believe that there is not a disposition in the American public to support the measures suggested in the President's message, and thus encourage the foreign power to withhold justice, do much to prejudice the interests of the commercial class claiming the indemnity, in the eyes of their own countrymen. The Merchants and Insurance Companies, for whose benefit the successful negotiation with France was prosecuted, are for the most part enemies of the present Democratic administration. And if their special organs endeavor to impair the confidence at home and abroad in the public functionaries who have pressed their claims, by negotiation, to embarrass the administration, not merely upon political grounds, but in its very efforts to secure their individual rights and to maintain the great principles upon which the property of the commercial classes to which they belong depends, the indignation of the great mass of the people will be raised against their ingratitude, and if war shall become inevitable, it will be justly considered a war for the honor of the nation, as to the effect of which on the individual claimants concerned in a pecuniary sense, a perfect indifference will be felt. If the opposition in Congress, identified as it is, as a party with the mercantile interest, and representing it, should assume the ground taken by the National Intelligencer, and insist that the recommendation of the President to assert the rights of our merchants, should not be sustained, it is not impossible that some portion of the community might consider it in the light of a voluntary relinquishment of their rights, on the part of the merchants aggrieved, to avoid the consequences of a war. If the Representatives in Congress who are known to speak the sentiments of the commercial community, should come forward in the national councils, and avow, with the Intelligencer, that a refusal on the part of France to comply with her engagements, will not justify a resort to reprisals for redress, as recommended by the President, because reprisals may ultimately result in war, it will become a grave question with those representing that portion of the American People who have no other motive to vindicate the rights in question, but as their vindication is a matter connected with the national honor, whether such voluntary surrender of the claims by the parties interested, would not justify the country in considering them cancelled, and the treaty made for their benefit merged by their own dishonorable concessions.

We shall soon see, however, with what spirit those who represent the commercial class in Congress, will support the President in the stand he has taken to maintain their cause, and protect their property from pillage on the highway of nations. If their pusillanimous temper should induce them to shrink from the support of their own rights—if they are willing tamely to submit to a new confiscation of their property, by acquiescing in the confiscation of the debt acknowledged by treaty, they may expect, in future wars among the powers of Europe, to see their commerce again the prey of all the belligerents, to fill their military chests, and the nation must, like the Chinese, be content to draw itself within its shell, and never unfurl a flag beyond cannon shot of its own coast.—Globe.